Remarks

1.   Summary of the office action

In the office action mailed October 17, 2008, (i) the Examiner objected to the specification, (ii) the Examiner rejected claims 14, 21, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and (iii) the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21-23, and 25-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a publication entitled "Sprint PCS J2ME Application Environment" (hereinafter "Papineau").

2.   Claim amendments and pending claims

Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 19, 25, and 32, cancelled claims 6, 9, 10, 14, 21, 23, 27, 28, and 33, and added new claims 35-43. Claims 1-5, 7, 12, 13, 15-19, 22, 25, 26, 29-32, and 34-43 are currently pending. Of the pending claims, claims 1, 13, 19, 25, and 32 are independent.

3.   Response to the objection to the specification

The Examiner objected to the specification because it contained an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code at page 13, line 11, and page 14, line 13. The Examiner indicated that Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant has amended the specification by: (i) deleting the paragraph starting at page 12, line 1, (ii) deleting text from the paragraphs starting at page 13, line 9, page 14, line 10, page 28, line 1, page 28, line 6, page 42, line 5, and page 42, line 10, and (iii) deleting Tables 5 and 6.

4.   Response to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 14, 21, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has cancelled claims 14, 21, and 27.

- 14 -

5. Response to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

a. Claims 1-5, 7, 12, 19, 22, 25, 26, and 29-32

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 12, 19, 22, 25, 26, and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papineau. Of these claims, claims 1, 19, 25, and 32 are independent. Applicant submits that claims 1, 19, 25, and 32, as amended, patentably distinguish over Papineau.

With respect to claims 1 and 32, Papineau does not reasonably lead to the object-oriented object class for accepting input data into a MIDlet within a MIDlet Suite, wherein the input data includes a Uniform Resource Indicator (URI) scheme selected from the group consisting of (i) tel:, and (ii) im:. With respect to claim 19, Papineau does not reasonably lead to the MIDlet using one or more object-oriented methods in the object-oriented class to accept from the application management system the input data created by the MIDlet or the non-MIDlet application, wherein the input data includes a Uniform Resource Indicator (URI) scheme selected from the group consisting of (i) tel:, and (ii) im:. And with respect to claim 25, Papineau does not reasonably lead to a Muglet that includes a plurality of object-oriented methods in an object-oriented object class available for using input data created by another MIDlet or a non-MIDlet application, wherein the input data include a Uniform Resource Indicator (URI) scheme selected from the group consisting of (i) tel:, and (ii) im:.

Papineau, at best, discloses: (i) a class Muglet that allows a MIDlet to receive input parameters and data upon invocation, (ii) a "Muglet" is a MIDlet that accepts scheme and/or media file input by utilizing a Muglet class, (iii) a Muglet may register to handle one or more URI schemes, and (iv) a scheme example is Content-1-handler: scheme; mailto:. *See*, Papineau, pages 29, 32, and 33. But even if it is assumed, for the sake of argument, that the class Muglet

disclosed by Papineau amounts to the claimed first (or Muglet) object-oriented object class and that the data received by the class Muglet of Papineau amounts to a URI scheme, Applicant submits Papineau does not reasonably lead to the object-oriented object class for accepting input data into a MIDlet within a MIDlet Suite, wherein the input data includes a Uniform Resource Indicator (URI) scheme selected from the group consisting of tel: and im:, as recited in various ways in independent claims 1, 19, 25, and 32.

Because Papineau does not reasonably lead to each and every element of independent claims 1, 19, 25, and 32, Applicant submits that claims 1, 19, 25, and 32 are not obvious over Papineau, and thus claims 1, 19, 25, and 32 are allowable. Further, because each of claims 2-5, 7, 12, 22, 26, 29-31, and 35-43 depends from one of allowable claims 1, 19, 25, and 32 and necessarily includes all of the limitations of one of claims 1, 19, 25, and 32, Applicant submits that claims 2-5, 7, 12, 22, 26, 29-31, and 35-43 are allowable as well.

b.   Claims 13, 15-18, and 34

The Examiner rejected claims 13, 15-18, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papineau. Of these claims, claim 13 is independent. Applicant submits that claim 13, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Papineau. In particular, Papineau does not reasonably lead to passing the output data from the MIDlet to the application management system, wherein the output data from the MIDlet includes an identifier of the MIDlet, as recited in claim 13.

At best, Papineau discloses: (i) an Application Management System (AMS) can process context passed out from a MIDlet using an "Exit URI" in a system class, (ii) a class system including "static void setExitURI(java.lang.String exit URI" sets a URI that the AMS will invoke when the MIDlet exits by calling notifyDestroyed(), and (iii) the class system including

- 16 -

"static void setCallbackURI(java.lang.String URI)" sets a URI that will be returned to the MIDlet, via a Muglet interface, if the AMS re-invokes the MIDlet after processing the exit URI. *See*, Papineau, pages 28 and 30. But even if it is assumed, for the sake of argument, that the URI set by static void setExitURI or by setCallbackURI amounts to output data passed from the MIDlet to the AMS, Applicant submits that Papineau does not disclose or suggest that either of these URI includes an identifier of the MIDlet that passes the output data to the AMS.

Because Papineau does not reasonably lead to each and every element of claim 13, Applicant submits that claim 13 is not obvious over Papineau, and thus claim 13 is allowable. Further, because each of claims 15-18 and 34 depends from claim 13 and necessarily includes all of the limitations of claim 13, claims 15-18 and 34 are allowable as well.

6. Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this response. However, failure to address a specific rejection or assertion made by the Examiner does not signify that Applicant agrees with or concedes that rejection or assertion.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 7, 12, 13, 15-19, 22, 25, 26, 29-32, and 34-43 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: January 13, 2009

By:____/David L. Ciesielski/_____
David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432